

REMARKS

Claims 19 and 20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 19 and 20 are amended. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the claims are asserted to be too long and contain unimportant details.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the elements recited in claims 19-20 are important and required elements of the claimed apparatus. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are thus respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cohen (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,151) or by Loan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,711). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Cohen or Loan et al. in view of Ke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,284,093) and Hasegawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,554,249). These rejections are traversed as they may apply to the above amended claims.

Applicants respectfully note that the parent application (U.S. Patent Application Serial Number 09/410,898) was filed on October 2, 1999. Applicants further respectfully note that the parent application of the present application was filed on July 27, 1999. Thus, Cohen cannot properly be applied as prior art against the present application.

Loan et al. is directed to a film processing system. The Office Action asserts that "the apparatus taught by Cohen is clearly capable of conducting applicant's claimed process" (page 5, second paragraph, of the Office Action).

In order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended claims 19-20 to further include "a source of an etching gas comprising chlorine gas, oxygen gas and one of either hydrogen gas or hydrogen chloride gas." As Loan et al. do not teach or suggest a source of either of these two combinations of gases, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19 and 20 are distinguishable from Loan et al.

Additionally, Applicants note that Ke et al. is cited to show four electromagnets which surround an etching chamber. However, Ke et al. nowhere teach or suggest a source of either of the two combinations of gases now required by claim 20.

Similarly, Hasegawa et al., which is cited to show a two jointed robot, do not teach or suggest a source of either of the two combinations of gases now required by claim 20.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and claims 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment for any additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper to Counsel's

Deposit Account 01-2300, referring to client-matter number 101136-00103 Thus, please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, making reference to Attorney Docket No. 101136-00103.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert K. Carpenter", written over a horizontal line.

Robert K. Carpenter
Registration No. 34,794

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RKC/tdd

TECH/243485.1